

Serial No. 09/741856

- 2 -

Art Unit: 2666

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 39 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Calvignac et al. (U.S. 6,298,340). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' exemplary independent claim 1 sets forth:

“A method for performing a plurality of filter operations on a data packet using an instruction, comprising:  
receiving an instruction to filter at least one data packet;  
retrieving a filter result based on the received instruction; and  
performing a plurality of filter operations on the at least one data packet in accordance with the retrieved filter result.”

The Applicants' invention enables the capability of performing a plurality of filter operations on a data packet in accordance with a retrieved filter result. Calvignac, in contrast, operates in the conventional manner wherein one filter operation is performed per filter result.

The Office Action states that the Applicants' claimed step of “performing a plurality of filter operations on the at least one data packet in accordance with the retrieved filter result” is anticipated by “the plurality of actions 1 – N shown in Figure 4”. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Only one of the actions 1 – N is performed for a given rule set result. See Col. 5 lines 65 – Col. 6 line 4: “The process from Block 46 then descends into one of the Action Blocks labeled 1 – N.” Calvignac therefore fails to teach or suggest the applicants' claimed step of “performing a plurality of filter operations on the at least one data packet in accordance with the

Serial No. 09/741856

- 3 -

Art Unit: 2666

retrieved filter result". The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 – 13 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants' independent claim 14 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1.

The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that claim 14 and its dependent claims 15 – 26 are in condition for allowance for the same reasons as set forth with regard to claim 1.

The Applicants' independent claim 27 also includes limitations similar to those of claim

1. The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that claim 27 and its dependent claims 28 – 39 are in condition for allowance for the same reasons as set forth with regard to claim 1.

Serial No. 09/741856

- 4 -

Art Unit: 2666

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

9/16/04  
Date

Mary Steubing  
Lindsay G. McGuinness, Reg. No. 38,549  
Mary Steubing, Reg. No. 37,946  
David A. Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809  
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park Drive  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-098  
Dd: 09/24/2004